

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-10 and 13-22 are pending. This communication amends claims 1, 3, 9 and 13. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,327,592 to Yoshikawa.

In response, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A method of displaying data in a software program on a multi-layer display having at least two screens, the method comprising the steps of:

- a) assigning a particular screen designation code to a first group of data, and
- b) assigning other screen designation codes to second and other groups of data,
wherein the screen designation codes determine[[s]] on which of the screens in the multi layer display the group of data is displayed.

Yoshikawa does not expressly or inherently describe a “method of displaying data in a software program on a multi-layer display having at least two screens... wherein the screen designation codes determine on which of the screens in the multi layer display the group of data is displayed.”

Instead, Yoshikawa describes a data calculator comprising a “display section 108 such as a CRT.” (See Yoshikawa, col. 8, lines 31-37 and Fig. 1). Applicant is not aware of a CRT display that has at least two screens, as now required in claim 1. Moreover, Figure 7 of Yoshikawa does not show a multi-layer display having at least two screens. According to Yoshikawa at col. 7, lines 60-61, Figure 7 shows a single display screen, i.e., “FIG. 7 is a diagram showing an example of the display screen of the display section 108.”

Because Yoshikawa fails to expressly or inherently describe all of the features of independent claim 1, claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Likewise, claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 10, which depend from claim 1 and recite additional features of the invention, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as stated for claim 1. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

3. Claims 13-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,859,907 to McGarry.

Independent claim 13 requires a “a multi-layer display having front and back screens.” Independent claim 18 requires “a multilayer screen comprising front and back screens.”

McGarry does not describe “a multi-layer display having front and back screens” or “a multilayer screen comprising front and back screens,” as respectively required in claim 13 and claim 18. Col. 3, lines 8-22 of McGarry describes:

The screen of the monitor 11 depicts a semitransparent spreadsheet 16 superimposed on an image and graphics layer 17 to form a composite display of the invention...The semitransparent spreadsheet 16 can also be displayed in a split-screen arrangement wherein the image and graphics layer 17 is displayed on one portion of the screen of the monitor 11, and the semitransparent spreadsheet 16...can be displayed in another portion of the screen of the monitor 11. Alternatively, the image and graphics layer 17 can be displayed on the screen of the monitor 11, and the semitransparent spreadsheet 16...can be displayed on the screen of a second monitor (not shown).

Thus, McGarry does not describe a multi-layer display with front and back screens as alleged by the examiner. McGarry merely describes a monitor having a single screen that displays graphic layers.

In addition, the “dual screen” approach referred to by the examiner in McGarry does not use “a multi-layer display having front and back screens” or “a multilayer screen comprising front and back screens,” as respectively required in claims 13-17 and 18-22. The dual screen approach of McGarry uses two separate monitors each having a single screen.

Because McGarry fails to expressly or inherently describe all of the features of independent claims 13 and 18, these claims are believed to be allowable. Likewise, claims 14-17, which depend from claim 13 and recite additional features of the invention and claims 19-22, which depend from claim 18 and recite additional features of the invention, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as stated for claims 13 and 18. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

4. Claims 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of the reference to Courter et al. (Courter).

Claims 3 and 8 both depend from claim 1, and thus contains all of the limitations of the claim 1. As noted above with respect to the allowability of claim 1 over Yoshikawa, the Yoshikawa patent fails to describe a “method of displaying data in a software program on a multi-layer display having at least two screens...wherein the screen designation codes determine on which of the screens in the multi layer display the group of data is displayed,” as required by claims 3 and 8. The Courter reference fails to remedy this deficiency, as it merely discloses a typical spread sheet, in which sheet tabs and navigation buttons are provided to move to other worksheets and to scroll through sheet tabs.

Thus, Yoshikawa in view of Counter fail to arrive at the invention of claims 3 and 8.

Therefore, claims 3 and 8 are believed to be allowable. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.


5. Claim 13 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for all terms of the claim.

Claims 3 and 9 have been amended to be consistent with the amendments made to claim 1.

6. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested as it is believed that all outstanding issues have been addressed herein and, further, that claims 1-10 and 13-22 are in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions or matters whose resolution may be advanced by a telephone call, the examiner is cordially invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at his number listed below.

7. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any filing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17, which are associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2061.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Schwarz
Registration. No. 37,577

DUANE MORRIS LLP
P.O. Box 5203
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5203
Tel: (609) 631-2446
Fax: (609) 631-2401